



Anker, S. D. et al. (2016) Traditional and new composite endpoints in heart failure clinical trials: facilitating comprehensive efficacy assessments and improving trial efficiency. *European Journal of Heart Failure*, 18(5), pp. 482-489.

There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/120856/>

Deposited on: 20 September 2017

Enlighten – Research publications by members of the University of Glasgow
<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk>

Traditional and New Composite Endpoints in Heart Failure Clinical Trials: Facilitating Comprehensive Efficacy Assessments and Improving Trial Efficiency

Stefan D. Anker¹; Stefan Schroeder²; Dan Atar³; Jeroen J. Bax⁴; Claudio Ceconi⁵; Martin R. Cowie⁶; Adam Crisp⁷; Fabienne Dominjon⁸; Ian Ford⁹; Hossein-Ardeschir Ghofrani¹⁰⁻¹²; Savion Gropper¹³; Gerhard Hindricks¹⁴; Mark A. Hlatky¹⁵; Richard Holcomb¹⁶; Narimon Honarpour¹⁷; J. Wouter Jukema⁴; Albert M. Kim¹⁸; Michael Kunz²; Martin Lefkowitz¹⁹; Chantal Le Floch⁸; Ulf Landmesser²⁰; Theresa A. McDonagh²¹; John J. McMurray²²; Bela Merkely²³; Milton Packer²⁴; Krishna Prasad²⁵; James Revkin¹⁸; Giuseppe Rosano^{26, 27}; Ransi Somaratne¹⁷; Wendy Gattis Stough²⁸; Adriaan A. Voors²⁹; Frank Ruschitzka³⁰

¹University Medical Center Gottingen, Gottingen, Germany; ²Bayer Healthcare, Berlin, Germany; ³Department of Cardiology B, Oslo University Hospital Ulleval and University of Oslo, Norway; ⁴Department of Cardiology, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands; ⁵ Unit of Cardiology, Hospital of Desenzano del Garda, Desenzano del Garda, Italy; ⁶National Heart and Lung Institute, Imperial College London, London, United Kingdom; ⁷GlaxoSmithKline, Middlesex, United Kingdom; ⁸Servier International, Paris, France; ⁹Robertson Centre for Biostatistics, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, United Kingdom; ¹⁰University of Giessen and Marburg Lung Center, UGMLC (member of the German Center for Lung Research [DZL]), Giessen, Germany; ¹¹Kerckhoff-Klinik Bad Nauheim, Germany; ¹²Imperial College London, United Kingdom; ¹³Boehringer-Ingelheim GmbH & Co. KG, Ingelheim, Germany; ¹⁴Department of Electrophysiology, Heart Center, University of Leipzig, Leipzig, Germany; ¹⁵Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, California, United

States; ¹⁶Independent Biostatistician, Minneapolis, Minnesota; ¹⁷Amgen, Inc.; Thousand Oaks, California, United States; ¹⁸Pfizer, Inc., Cambridge, Massachusetts, United States; ¹⁹Novartis Pharmaceuticals, East Hanover, New Jersey, United States; ²⁰Department of Cardiology, Charité Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Berlin, Germany; ²¹King's College Hospital, London, United Kingdom; ²²BHF Cardiovascular Research Centre, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, Scotland, United Kingdom; ²³Semmelweis University Heart and Vascular Center, Budapest, Hungary; ²⁴Department of Clinical Sciences, University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center, Dallas, Texas, United States; ²⁵United Kingdom Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency, London, United Kingdom; ²⁶IRCCS San Raffaele Hospital Roma, Rome, Italy; ²⁷Cardiovascular and Cell Sciences Institute, St. George's University of London, London, United Kingdom; ²⁸Campbell University College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences, North Carolina, United States; ²⁹University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands; ³⁰Department of Cardiology, Heart Failure Clinic and Transplantation, University Heart Center Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

Corresponding Author: Stefan D. Anker, MD PhD; Division of Innovative Clinical Trials, Department of Cardiology & Pneumology, University Medical Center Göttingen (UMG); Robert-Koch-Str. 40; D-37075 Göttingen, Germany; Email: s.anker@cachexia.de

Abstract

Composite endpoints are commonly used as the primary measure of efficacy in heart failure clinical trials to assess the overall treatment effect and to increase the efficiency of trials.

Clinical trials still must enroll large numbers of patients to accrue a sufficient number of outcome events and have adequate power to draw conclusions about the efficacy and safety of new treatments for heart failure. Additionally, the societal and health-system perspectives on heart failure have raised interest in ascertaining the effects of therapy on outcomes such as repeat hospitalization and the patient's burden of disease. Thus, novel methods for using composite endpoints in clinical trials (e.g., clinical status composite endpoints, recurrent event analyses) are being applied in current and planned trials. Endpoints that measure functional status or reflect the patient experience are important but used cautiously because heart failure treatments may improve function yet have adverse effects on mortality. This paper discusses the use of traditional and new composite endpoints, identifies qualities of robust composites, and outlines opportunities for future research.

Keywords: heart failure, clinical trial, endpoint determination, surrogate endpoints

INTRODUCTION

Composite endpoints are increasingly used as primary efficacy measures in heart failure clinical trials (Supplemental Appendix Table 1)¹ to provide a comprehensive picture of the treatment effect, and to improve trial efficiency by increasing the event rate and reducing the required sample size. They have advantages and disadvantages (Table 1),¹⁻⁴ but composite endpoints are generally accepted by academics, clinicians, and regulators when the components are well-defined, specific to the key objective of interest, and broadly congruent in regards to treatment effect. They are problematic when the overall effect suggests no benefit, or even harm, in one or more components.

The adoption of evidence-based therapies has reduced event rates for well-established composites (e.g., all-cause mortality plus cardiovascular hospitalization; cardiovascular death plus heart failure hospitalization). Thus, large studies with long follow-up are still needed in modern trials to accrue a sufficient number of events for adequate statistical power. These studies require substantial investment from funders (e.g., public or industry sources) who must decide whether to commit significant funds when there is a real risk that the therapy will be ineffective. Industry investment in cardiovascular drug development has been decreasing, perhaps in part because of these reasons,^{5;6} and cardiovascular disease is no longer one of the top ten therapeutic areas for research and development.⁷

It is a matter of debate whether the composite of cardiovascular mortality or heart failure hospitalization is the most meaningful and clinically relevant endpoint. New endpoints (e.g., novel clinical composites, functional measures, or patient reported outcomes) or analytic methodologies (e.g., recurrent event analyses, responder analyses) might serve the dual purpose

of more accurately reflecting the modern heart failure patient's disease burden and improving trial efficiency. However, confirmation of their validity is needed before they can achieve widespread acceptance.

The Cardiovascular Round Table (CRT) of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC) convened a two-day workshop to explore how existing and innovative composite endpoints can be leveraged to advance the conduct of heart failure clinical trials and, ultimately, patient care. Workshop participants identified five qualities that should characterize composite endpoints in heart failure clinical trials (Table 2). This paper summarizes the key insights and discussions, suggests approaches for using composite endpoints, and identifies knowledge gaps that need to be addressed by further research.

OVERVIEW OF COMPOSITE ENDPOINTS IN HEART FAILURE TRIALS

Fatal and Non-Fatal Composite Clinical Outcomes

All-cause assessments of fatal and non-fatal outcomes (e.g., all-cause mortality plus all-cause hospitalization) reflect an intervention's net benefit. Since a single intervention is unlikely to reduce all modes of death or causes of hospitalization, a significant reduction in an all-cause composite endpoint can be interpreted to indicate that the intervention reduced the major causes of death or hospitalization (usually cardiovascular in heart failure trials) without significant adverse effects.¹

Estimated treatment effects may be diluted if a substantial proportion of events are not influenced by the treatment.⁸ A greater number of events will increase statistical power only if those additional events are potentially modifiable by the intervention. The addition of outcomes that are not influenced by the treatment will reduce the measured treatment effect and the study

power. Thus, composite endpoints should only include components that are relevant to the population being studied and have biological plausibility to support an expected treatment benefit on each component. A significant risk reduction in a composite endpoint does not necessarily imply that the risk reduction is equal across each component. Statistical methods to test for heterogeneity of treatment effect across individual components of a composite endpoint have been described but are likely to be underpowered.^{9,10} Typically, reporting the individual components and testing the treatment effect on each is sufficient.

Similar logic applies to all-cause versus cause-specific endpoints. The Candesartan in Heart Failure Assessment of Reduction in Mortality and Morbidity (CHARM) trials, which included a broad spectrum of heart failure patients, used all-cause mortality as the primary endpoint for the overall program.¹¹ Out of 1831 deaths, 371 were non-cardiovascular and unlikely to be influenced by cardiovascular therapy. While the unadjusted hazard ratio (HR) for the effect of candesartan on all-cause mortality was not statistically significant (HR 0.91, 95% confidence interval [CI] 0.83-1.00, $p=0.055$), the effect on cardiovascular mortality (a cause-specific endpoint) was significant (HR 0.88, CI 0.79-0.97, $p=0.012$).¹¹

Owing in part to this experience, heart failure trials are often now designed with cause-specific composite endpoints (e.g., cardiovascular mortality or heart failure hospitalization). Cause-specific endpoints reflect a more precise evaluation of an intervention's expected effect, since it is unlikely that a cardiovascular drug will reduce non-cardiovascular causes of death (e.g., cancer, accidents). When cause-specific primary endpoints are used, all-cause mortality should still be evaluated as a secondary or safety endpoint to ensure that survival is not adversely affected by another pathway. The effect on all-cause mortality should be directionally similar to the effect on cardiovascular mortality (if the majority of deaths are disease-related), even if the

effect on all-cause mortality is not statistically significant. If cardiovascular mortality is significantly reduced and all-cause mortality is shifted towards the null, further analyses are needed to explain the findings and explore whether some component of non-cardiovascular mortality was increased in the treated versus the control arm. Similarly, discordant results in individual components may be concerning and warrant further investigation, even if risk is reduced in the overall composite. Such analyses are exploratory and not likely to be definitive (depending on the number of events), but they can inform further research strategies to clarify the non-cardiovascular or discordant effects.

Limitations of cause-specific endpoints include the need for specific event definitions and endpoint adjudication. The precision of adjudication depends on complete medical records, which may be limited for out-of-hospital deaths or some regions in global trials. External factors (e.g., geographical standards of care, threshold for admission, reimbursement pressures, availability of outpatient treatment, and medical or dietary non-adherence) may influence cause-specific hospitalization, although proper randomization should minimize the impact of these factors. These factors may have greater impact if a majority of patients are enrolled in regions with large differences in standards of care.

Reporting the individual components of composite endpoints is important to examine whether or not they are concordant, but non-fatal endpoints should not be analyzed independently because of the problem of competing risks.¹² Composite endpoints can solve this dilemma if they include both fatal and non-fatal events. However, analyzing fatal and non-fatal events in a composite endpoint can be problematic because these events differ in their importance. The least serious events (i.e., hospitalizations in heart failure trials, non-fatal myocardial infarctions in acute coronary syndrome trials) usually occur earlier than more serious

events (i.e. death). Time-to-event analysis focuses on the first event. Thus, composite endpoints are often driven by the least serious component,¹³ which decreases the relevance (not confidence) of any finding. For example, in the Systolic Heart Failure Treatment with the I_f Inhibitor Ivabradine Trial (SHIFT) study, the primary endpoint was a composite of cardiovascular death or hospital admission for worsening heart failure.¹⁴ Ivabradine reduced the risk of the primary endpoint compared with placebo in patients with a heart rate ≥ 70 beats per minute (HR 0.82, CI 0.75-0.90, $p < 0.0001$), mainly driven by a reduction in heart failure hospitalizations (16% vs. 21%, HR 0.74, CI 0.66-0.83, $p < 0.0001$) with no effect on cardiovascular mortality (14% vs. 15%, HR 0.91, CI 0.80-1.03, $p = 0.13$).¹⁴ The European Medicines Agency (EMA) approved ivabradine, but only for patients with heart rates above 75 beats per minute where a possible nominal reduction in overall mortality was observed.¹⁵ Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approval was recently granted for a reduction in heart failure hospitalization in patients with a heart rate ≥ 70 beats per minute. Based on results from the Valsartan Heart Failure Trial (Val-HeFT), valsartan was approved by the FDA to reduce hospitalization for heart failure, with no indication for improvement in mortality because it reduced only one of the two primary endpoints: 1) all-cause mortality (relative risk 1.02, CI 0.88-1.18, $p = 0.80$) and 2) the composite of all-cause mortality or cardiac arrest with resuscitation, hospitalization for heart failure, or administration of intravenous inotropes or vasodilators for ≥ 4 hours without hospitalization (relative risk 0.87, CI 0.77-0.97, $p = 0.009$). The beneficial effect of valsartan on the latter was driven by a reduction in heart failure hospitalization.¹⁶ Statistical methods to weight outcomes according to severity have been proposed in heart failure and other disease states.¹⁷⁻²² However, these approaches are limited by lack of consensus on the relative weighting of events and inconsistency across studies.

These examples underscore the importance of limiting composites to include events that are clinically meaningful and considered to be modifiable. It is highly recommended that regulatory agencies be involved early in the process of constructing composite endpoints for use in pivotal trials.

Clinical Status Composite Endpoints

In chronic conditions such as heart failure, mortality is not the only meaningful efficacy measure, since a patient may be alive but have a poor clinical status, functional capacity, or quality of life.²³ A treatment may be worthwhile and considered valuable by patients when it improves their clinical status even if it does not prolong their survival.^{24;25} A clinical status composite endpoint has been developed²⁶ and used²⁷⁻³⁰ in heart failure trials (with adaptations appropriate for the study population). Patients are categorized as improved (moderate or marked improvement in clinical status at all planned assessments without hospitalization for heart failure or death); unchanged (modest improvement or worsening in clinical status); or worsened (moderate or marked worsening of clinical status at any planned assessment, hospitalization for heart failure requiring intravenous or mechanical interventions, or death). The distribution of responses can be compared between treatment groups without assigning ranks or worse scores to the individual components.²⁶ This method has the advantage of describing the patient's clinical course and response to treatment, but more experience is needed to validate that it produces a reliable, clinically meaningful, and unbiased estimate of treatment effect. Analyses can determine if a statistically significant difference exists in the distribution of patients who improved, worsened, or were unchanged, but the magnitude or clinical relevance of the effect can be challenging to interpret. Achieving consensus regarding what constitutes clinically

meaningful degrees of improvement and worsening (recognizing that the criteria will differ to some extent by study population) is one challenge of implementing this endpoint. Variation in standards for hospitalizations across geographic regions may also be problematic, but capturing moderate to marked worsening in symptoms or functional status might minimize the problem of geographic variation in standards of care. Finally, experience with this endpoint suggests that it is most appropriate for relatively short-term trials (<9 months) because of the challenges related to assessing changes in a patient's clinical improvement over lengthy time periods (i.e., patient recall) and because more clinical events accrue during long-term follow-up which outweigh the clinical status improvement component of the composite.

FUNCTIONAL ENDPOINTS

Most clinicians agree that functional impairment is a primary concern for patients with heart failure. For some patients, improved functional status or quality of life is of greater importance than longevity.^{24;25} Patients are surviving longer with heart failure because of therapeutic advances,³¹ so assessing functional status may be of even greater importance in this era of improved survival. The primary goal of considering novel composite endpoints that include functional status or patient reported symptom measures is to identify treatments that improve important aspects of patient well-being beyond survival. However, few, if any, cardiovascular drugs have been approved on the basis of improved functional status alone. Regulators have been cautious about functional-status endpoints in cardiovascular clinical trials because of agents that improved exercise tolerance but increased mortality in large trials (e.g., flosequinan).³² The problem of defining a clinically meaningful change in exercise time (or

other measure of functional status) also contributes to the uncertainty about the value of this endpoint.

A clinically meaningful improvement in functional status may lead to approval of a new therapeutic agent, provided that an adequate margin of safety can be assured.¹ A stringent margin for excluding an adverse effect on mortality would likely be required in a trial using a functional primary endpoint. Thus, efficiencies gained by using novel composites may be offset by the need to demonstrate safety, since studies would still need to be large and long enough to rule out an increased risk of mortality (at some threshold level acceptable to regulatory agencies) or provide reasonable assurance of a neutral effect on mortality.

The persisting question is what endpoint(s) (other than death or hospitalization) might be clinically relevant and scientifically valid, while also increasing the efficiency of drug development and clinical trial conduct. The 6-minute walk test distance has been the primary endpoint in most registration trials of pulmonary artery hypertension,^{33;34} accepted by both EMA and FDA, but it has not been recognized as adequate in heart failure. Other functional measures such as peak VO₂ might be candidate endpoints for heart failure trials, but they are unphysiological, can be influenced by patient motivation and skeletal muscle function, and may not be consistently reproducible, which limits their use as an endpoint in heart failure and other (e.g., pulmonary hypertension) trials. Health-related quality of life as measured by instruments such as Minnesota Living With Heart Failure Score (MLWHF) or the Kansas City Cardiomyopathy Questionnaire (KCCQ) might be considered as endpoints and have been used in many studies, but the FDA has specific standards that must be met when patient reported outcomes are used to support labeling claims.^{35;36} While health-related quality of life assessments are clinically relevant and can be informative, the methodologic problems of using

such scores in efficacy assessments (e.g., potential for bias particularly in unblinded studies, procedures for handling missing data) are well known.³⁵ Whether regulatory agencies would accept the MLWHF or KCCQ as supportive evidence of efficacy remains to be seen and would likely need to be considered on an individual trial basis.

Finally, another important consideration is the health technology assessment of new drugs after regulatory approval. Even if an endpoint such as 6-minute walk distance were accepted by regulators, it is uncertain whether payers would view it as a worthwhile endpoint. Research would need to validate the level of increased exercise tolerance that was cost-effective and had a societal benefit.

Role of Adaptive Licensing

In 2007, EMA described its openness to innovative drug development approaches.³⁷ One such initiative is the Pilot Project on Adaptive Licensing.³⁸ Adaptive licensing involves an authorized limited indication followed by “iterative phases of evidence gathering and progressive licensing adaptations concerning both the authorized indication and the potential further therapeutic uses of the drug”.³⁸ With adaptive licensing, a drug could be approved based on improvement in a well-defined functional endpoint within a rigorously conducted clinical trial. After licensing, post-authorization efficacy and safety studies would be required.³⁸⁻⁴⁰ This process fulfils the goal of accelerating patient access to new drugs, while providing a mechanism for collecting safety data. Functional status or patient-reported symptom endpoints could have a role in adaptive licensing, but past experiences in heart failure where initially promising drugs have later been found harmful (e.g., ibopamine, flosequinan) emphasize the need to pursue this approach cautiously. Many issues have been identified with this approach. First, it is uncertain

if a relatively short-term trial assessing a functional endpoint will accrue a sufficient number of events to provide early estimates of safety prior to granting an adaptive license. Additionally, the safety margin for excluding excess risk needs to be defined and achieving harmonization among regulatory bodies could be problematic. Presumably, the acceptable safety margin could vary by patient population, severity of illness, or the pre-test probability of risk in the context of the mechanism of action of the drug or device; thus, safety estimates should account for this variation. On the other hand, the adaptive approval process aims to accrue pharmacovigilance data in the early phase of marketing through registries, thereby monitoring the real-life use and adverse event rates of the drugs approved with this regulatory pathway.⁴¹ Conducting randomized clinical trials after a drug is marketed and available to patients is more difficult than pre-approval from the standpoint of subject recruitment and retention. All patients receiving the drug could be followed in a registry for safety, but the results of observational studies are less reliable because of the potential for bias. The current system is not optimally designed to allow regulators to enforce withdrawal of adaptive licences if the sponsor does not uphold the requirements of the licence (e.g., follow-up trials are not completed, a concerning safety signal emerges but falls short of crossing pre-defined margins of licence withdrawal, safety trials are poorly designed), particularly in the European Union where decisions to withdraw drugs are made by each member state. One approach would be to apply adaptive licensing only to severely ill patients where the balance of risks and benefits might be more favourable. However, once marketed, restrictions on use according to patient severity will be difficult to enforce.

STATISTICAL CONSIDERATIONS: NEW ANALYTIC METHODS

Recurrent Event Analyses

Heart failure is a chronic disease, typically characterized by repeat hospitalizations as a patient's condition progressively worsens. Several factors have contributed to an interest in analysing recurrent events in heart failure trials.⁴² Hospitalization is the major contributor to the overall cost of heart failure care,⁴³ which has led to targeted interventions to reduce readmissions.^{44;45} Therefore, data describing an intervention's effect on recurrent events is highly clinically relevant. Importantly, restricting analyses to first events incompletely represents the patient's overall burden of disease, since first events account for only half of the total number of heart failure hospitalizations in major clinical trials.⁴⁶⁻⁴⁹ Several approaches to recurrent event analyses have been tested using major heart failure trial datasets.⁴⁶⁻⁵¹ All have limitations, as complex assumptions are made in determining the study sample size and in the statistical modelling.⁵² One concern is overestimation of the treatment effect,⁴⁸ and another is how best to manage the competing risk of death. Either the joint frailty model or the negative binomial distribution (if death rates are low) have been used,^{48;50} but none of the methods have been well validated. Regulatory acceptance of the methodology is a critical aspect, and the agencies appear to be supportive of an analysis strategy based on recurrent events. The primary endpoint of the PARAGON-HF study (Prospective Comparison of ARNI with ARB Global Outcomes in Heart Failure With Preserved Ejection Fraction, NCT01920711) is the cumulative number of primary composite events of cardiovascular death and total (first and recurrent) heart failure hospitalizations.⁵³ PARAGON-HF was also designed to have reasonable power on a standard time-to-first event analysis for sensitivity comparisons. This approach allows regulators and investigators to gain experience with a recurrent-events method against a background of traditional time-to-first event analysis.

Responder Analyses

Responder analyses are used to assess the clinical relevance of an observed treatment effect.^{36;54;55} From the EMA perspective, responder analyses have been used in studies of obesity (e.g., comparison of proportion of patients with $\geq 10\%$ weight loss), acute stroke (e.g., comparison of proportion of survivors who regain functional independence), or depression (e.g., comparison of proportion of patients achieving a threshold change in symptom scores). The challenge with responder analyses, especially in heart failure trials, is defining, validating, and achieving consensus on the clinically meaningful change in a functional measure or symptom score.^{35;56-58} In the context of a heart failure trial, a responder analysis could be based on a surrogate variable that is expected to be related to reliable clinical improvement or clinical outcome. Historically, measures of functional status on which responder analyses might be based (e.g., exercise time, left ventricular size, ejection fraction, haemodynamics) inconsistently correlate with clinical outcome. Scales to measure symptoms, dyspnoea, functional status, and health-related quality of life are alternatives to surrogates and have been used across clinical trials. Interpretation of treatment effect is difficult since effect size for the same treatment can differ when measured on different scales, and definition of a clinically important change can be arbitrary and that attenuation of decline, i.e. no change, may itself be an indicator of benefit. Importantly, study power can be substantially reduced in a responder analysis when a continuous outcome measure is dichotomized.⁵⁹

Responder analyses might be useful in phase I and II trials to help inform phase III designs and patient selection criteria; however, many well-known examples exist where favorable phase II results did not translate into improved outcome in phase III.⁶⁰ Therefore, cautious interpretation of phase II results used for this purpose is advised. On the other hand, if

efficacy is demonstrated using traditional methods, responder analyses can be performed secondarily to characterize the clinical relevance of the effect and to evaluate the potential for hyper-responders (in cardiac resynchronization therapy trials often called super-responders), non-responders, or patients who experience harm. Signals of efficacy or harm observed in subgroups are far from definitive, but they can generate new hypotheses for testing in adequately powered studies within the specific population that appeared to have the greatest treatment effect. Assessing heterogeneity of benefit or net benefit, balancing benefit and harm, using subgroups based on a risk score has been proposed as a more powerful approach to subgroup analysis.^{61;62} Responder analyses are also of interest to support health technology assessment. However, it is critical to acknowledge the limitations of these analyses to avoid over interpretation of the data.

CONCLUSION

The changing landscape for heart failure clinical trials has created an important opportunity to learn from past successes (and failures) and shape future approaches. The use of traditional composite endpoints has yielded many highly effective therapies, and the approach should not be abandoned. However, the overall health burden from heart failure on patients is broader than hospitalizations and death, and it will be important to conduct trials that reflect endpoints important to patients³⁵ (and payers). Further, the declining resources for conducting larger, longer, and more costly trials is a reality that cannot be ignored.⁵ Composites that reflect both clinical status and traditional “hard” events, new analytic methodologies to assess recurrent events, and renewed efforts to assess changes in functional status (without ignoring safety) are areas of both interest and uncertainty that will benefit from additional research (Table 3).

Ongoing trials will provide more insight into the strengths and weaknesses of these approaches and inform future directions in heart failure research.

Acknowledgements

This paper was generated from discussions during a Cardiovascular Round Table (CRT) Workshop organized on 21-22 January 2015 by the European Society of Cardiology (ESC). The CRT is a strategic forum for high-level dialogues between industry and ESC leadership to identify and discuss key strategic issues for the future of cardiovascular health in Europe.

The opinions expressed in this paper are those of the authors and cannot be interpreted as the opinion of any of the organizations that employ the authors.

The authors acknowledge the contribution of Caroline Boulton for participating in the discussion at the ESC CRT workshop from which this paper originated.

Conflicts of Interest

Stefan D. Anker: Research grants from Vifor and Abbott Vascular; personal fees from Vifor, Abbott Vascular, Bayer Pharma, Novartis, Lonestar Heart, Respicardia, ZS Pharma, Relypsa, Biotronik, Cardiorentis, Servier

Stefan Schroeder: Employee of Bayer Healthcare

Dan Atar: Personal fees from Astra-Zeneca, Bayer Healthcare, Boehringer-Ingelheim, BMS/Pfizer, Novartis, Vifor

Jeroen J. Bax: Nothing to disclose

Claudio Ceconi: Nothing to disclose

Martin R. Cowie: Research grants from ResMed, Boston Scientific, and Bayer; personal fees from ResMed, Boston Scientific, Bayer, Servier, Novartis, St. Jude Medical, and Pfizer

Adam Crisp: Employee of GlaxoSmithKline

Fabienne Dominjon: Employee of Servier

Ian Ford: Nothing to disclose

Hossein-Ardeschir Ghofrani: Personal fees (board membership, consultancy, paid lectures, or travel expenses) from Actelion, Bayer, GSK, Novartis, Pfizer, Bellerophon Therapeutics, United Therapeutics; research grants from Actelion, Bayer, Pfizer, Novartis.

Savion Gropper: Employee of Boehringer-Ingelheim GmbH & Co.KG

Gerhard Hindricks: Research grants from St. Jude Medical, Biotronik, Boston Scientific

Mark A. Hlatky: Nothing to disclose

Richard Holcomb: Nothing to disclose

Narimon Honarpour: Employee of Amgen

J. Wouter Jukema: Research grants from and CME speaker for meeting sponsored by Astellas, Astra Zeneca, Bayer, Biotronik, Boston Scientific, Daiichi Sankyo, Lilly, Genzyme, Medtronic, Merck Schering Plough, Pfizer, Orbus Neich, Novartis, Roche, Servier, Sanofi Aventis, The Netherlands Heart Foundation, Interuniversity Cardiology Institute of the Netherlands, European Community Framework KP7 Programme

Albert M. Kim: Employee of Pfizer

Michael Kunz: Employee of Bayer Healthcare

Martin Lefkowitz: Employee of Novartis Pharmaceuticals Company

Chantal Le Floch: Employee of Servier

Ulf Landmesser: Research grants from Pfizer and Roche; honoraria (lecture and advisory) from Roche, MSD, Sanofi, and Amgen

Theresa A. McDonagh: Personal fees (honoraria) from Novartis, Vifor, ZS Pharma

John J. McMurray: Nothing to disclose

Bela Merkely: Personal fees (lectures and advisory board membership) from Orion Pharma

Milton Packer: Nothing to disclose

Krishna Prasad: Nothing to disclose.

James Revkin: Nothing to disclose.

Giuseppe Rosano: Nothing to disclose

Ransi Somaratne: Employee and shareholder of Amgen, Inc.

Wendy Gattis Stough: Personal fees from European Society of Cardiology, Relypsa, Covis, Stealth Peptides

Adriaan A. Voors: Research grant from Novartis Pharmaceuticals, Singulex, Sphingotec, Trevena, and Vifor; personal fees from Novartis Pharmaceuticals, Servier, Bayer, Boehringer Ingelheim, Cardio3Biosciences, Celladon, GSK, Merck/MSD, Singulex, Trevena, and Vifor; non-financial support from Alere and Merck/MSD

Frank Ruschitzka: Nothing to disclose

References

1. Zannad F, Garcia AA, Anker SD, Armstrong PW, Calvo G, Cleland JG, Cohn JN, Dickstein K, Domanski MJ, Ekman I, Filippatos GS, Gheorghiade M, Hernandez AF, Jaarsma T, Koglin J, Konstam M, Kupfer S, Maggioni AP, Mebazaa A, Metra M, Nowack C, Pieske B, Pina IL, Pocock SJ, Ponikowski P, Rosano G, Ruilope LM, Ruschitzka F, Severin T, Solomon S, Stein K, Stockbridge NL, Stough WG, Swedberg K, Tavazzi L, Voors AA, Wasserman SM, Woehrle H, Zalewski A, McMurray JJ. Clinical outcome endpoints in heart failure trials: a European Society of Cardiology Heart Failure Association consensus document. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2013;**15**:1082-1094.
2. Cordoba G, Schwartz L, Woloshin S, Bae H, Gotzsche PC. Definition, reporting, and interpretation of composite outcomes in clinical trials: systematic review. *BMJ* 2010;**341**:c3920.
3. Freemantle N, Calvert M, Wood J, Eastaugh J, Griffin C. Composite outcomes in randomized trials: greater precision but with greater uncertainty? *JAMA* 2003;**289**:2554-2559.
4. European Network for Health Technology Assessment. Endpoints used for relative effectiveness assessment of pharmaceuticals: Clinical Endpoints.
<https://eunethta.fedimbo.belgium.be/sites/5026.fedimbo.belgium.be/files/Clinical%20endpoints.pdf> Last updated: 2013; Accessed on: 2/15/15.
5. Jackson N, Atar D, Borentain M, Breithardt G, van Eickels M, Endres M, Fraass U, Friede T, Hannachi H, Janmohamed S, Kreuzer J, Landray M, Lautsch D, Le Floch C,

- Mol P, Naci H, Samani N, Svensson A, Thorstensen C, Tijssen J, Vandzhura V, Zalewski A, Kirchhof P. Improving clinical trials for cardiovascular diseases: a position paper from the Cardiovascular Roundtable of the European Society of Cardiology. *European Heart Journal* 2015; DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehv213>.
6. Roe MT, Mahaffey KW, Ezekowitz JA, Alexander JH, Goodman SG, Hernandez A, Temple T, Berdan L, Califf RM, Harrington RA, Peterson ED, Armstrong PW. The future of cardiovascular clinical research in North America and beyond-addressing challenges and leveraging opportunities through unique academic and grassroots collaborations. *Am Heart J* 2015;**169**:743-750.
 7. Moses H, III, Matheson DH, Cairns-Smith S, George BP, Palisch C, Dorsey ER. The anatomy of medical research: US and international comparisons. *JAMA* 2015;**313**:174-189.
 8. Gomez G, Gomez-Mateu M, Dafni U. Informed choice of composite end points in cardiovascular trials. *Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes* 2014;**7**:170-178.
 9. Pogue J, Thabane L, Devereaux PJ, Yusuf S. Testing for heterogeneity among the components of a binary composite outcome in a clinical trial. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2010;**10**:49.
 10. Pogue J, Devereaux PJ, Thabane L, Yusuf S. Designing and analyzing clinical trials with composite outcomes: consideration of possible treatment differences between the individual outcomes. *PLoS One* 2012;**7**:e34785.
 11. Pfeffer MA, Swedberg K, Granger CB, Held P, McMurray JJ, Michelson EL, Olofsson B, Ostergren J, Yusuf S, Pocock S, CHARM Investigators and Committees. Effects of

- candesartan on mortality and morbidity in patients with chronic heart failure: the CHARM-Overall programme. *Lancet* 2003;**362**:759-766.
12. Wolbers M, Koller MT, Stel VS, Schaer B, Jager KJ, Leffondre K, Heinze G. Competing risks analyses: objectives and approaches. *Eur Heart J* 2014;**35**:2936-2941.
 13. Ferreira-Gonzalez I, Busse JW, Heels-Ansdell D, Montori VM, Akl EA, Bryant DM, Alonso-Coello P, Alonso J, Worster A, Upadhye S, Jaeschke R, Schunemann HJ, Permyer-Miralda G, Pacheco-Huergo V, Domingo-Salvany A, Wu P, Mills EJ, Guyatt GH. Problems with use of composite end points in cardiovascular trials: systematic review of randomised controlled trials. *BMJ* 2007;**334**:786.
 14. Swedberg K, Komajda M, Bohm M, Borer JS, Ford I, Dubost-Brama A, Lerebours G, Tavazzi L. Ivabradine and outcomes in chronic heart failure (SHIFT): a randomised placebo-controlled study. *Lancet* 2010;**376**:875-885.
 15. Bohm M, Borer J, Ford I, Gonzalez-Juanatey JR, Komajda M, Lopez-Sendon J, Reil JC, Swedberg K, Tavazzi L. Heart rate at baseline influences the effect of ivabradine on cardiovascular outcomes in chronic heart failure: analysis from the SHIFT study. *Clin Res Cardiol* 2013;**102**:11-22.
 16. Cohn JN, Tognoni G, Valsartan Heart Failure Trial Investigators. A randomized trial of the angiotensin-receptor blocker valsartan in chronic heart failure. *N Engl J Med* 2001;**345**:1667-1675.
 17. Armstrong PW, Westerhout CM, Van de Werf F, Califf RM, Welsh RC, Wilcox RG, Bakal JA. Refining clinical trial composite outcomes: an application to the Assessment of the Safety and Efficacy of a New Thrombolytic-3 (ASSENT-3) trial. *Am Heart J* 2011;**161**:848-854.

18. Buyse M. Generalized pairwise comparisons of prioritized outcomes in the two-sample problem. *Stat Med* 2010;**29**:3245-3257.
19. Pocock SJ, Ariti CA, Collier TJ, Wang D. The win ratio: a new approach to the analysis of composite endpoints in clinical trials based on clinical priorities. *Eur Heart J* 2012;**33**:176-182.
20. Rauch G, Jahn-Eimermacher A, Brannath W, Kieser M. Opportunities and challenges of combined effect measures based on prioritized outcomes. *Stat Med* 2014;**33**:1104-1120.
21. Rauch G, Rauch B, Schuler S, Kieser M. Opportunities and challenges of clinical trials in cardiology using composite primary endpoints. *World J Cardiol* 2015;**7**:1-5.
22. Subherwal S, Anstrom KJ, Jones WS, Felker MG, Misra S, Conte MS, Hiatt WR, Patel MR. Use of alternative methodologies for evaluation of composite end points in trials of therapies for critical limb ischemia. *Am Heart J* 2012;**164**:277-284.
23. Cleland JG. How to assess new treatments for the management of heart failure: composite scoring systems to assess the patients' clinical journey. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2002;**4**:243-247.
24. Dev S, Clare RM, Felker GM, Fiuzat M, Warner SL, O'Connor CM. Link between decisions regarding resuscitation and preferences for quality over length of life with heart failure. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2012;**14**:45-53.
25. Stevenson LW, Hellkamp AS, Leier CV, Sopko G, Koelling T, Warnica JW, Abraham WT, Kasper EK, Rogers JG, Califf RM, Schramm EE, O'Connor CM. Changing preferences for survival after hospitalization with advanced heart failure. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2008;**52**:1702-1708.

26. Packer M. Proposal for a new clinical end point to evaluate the efficacy of drugs and devices in the treatment of chronic heart failure. *J Card Fail* 2001;**7**:176-182.
27. Redfield MM, Chen HH, Borlaug BA, Semigran MJ, Lee KL, Lewis G, LeWinter MM, Rouleau JL, Bull DA, Mann DL, Deswal A, Stevenson LW, Givertz MM, Ofili EO, O'Connor CM, Felker GM, Goldsmith SR, Bart BA, McNulty SE, Ibarra JC, Lin G, Oh JK, Patel MR, Kim RJ, Tracy RP, Velazquez EJ, Anstrom KJ, Hernandez AF, Mascette AM, Braunwald E. Effect of Phosphodiesterase-5 Inhibition on Exercise Capacity and Clinical Status in Heart Failure With Preserved Ejection Fraction: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA* 2013;**1**-10.
28. Abraham WT, Young JB, Leon AR, Adler S, Bank AJ, Hall SA, Lieberman R, Liem LB, O'Connell JB, Schroeder JS, Wheelan KR. Effects of cardiac resynchronization on disease progression in patients with left ventricular systolic dysfunction, an indication for an implantable cardioverter-defibrillator, and mildly symptomatic chronic heart failure. *Circulation* 2004;**110**:2864-2868.
29. Packer M, Colucci W, Fisher L, Massie BM, Teerlink JR, Young J, Padley RJ, Thakkar R, Delgado-Herrera L, Salon J, Garratt C, Huang B, Sarapohja T. Effect of levosimendan on the short-term clinical course of patients with acutely decompensated heart failure. *JACC Heart Fail* 2013;**1**:103-111.
30. Hindricks G, Taborsky M, Glikson M, Heinrich U, Schumacher B, Katz A, Brachmann J, Lewalter T, Goette A, Block M, Kautzner J, Sack S, Husser D, Piorkowski C, Sogaard P. Implant-based multiparameter telemonitoring of patients with heart failure (IN-TIME): a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2014;**384**:583-590.

31. Mozaffarian D, Benjamin EJ, Go AS, Arnett DK, Blaha MJ, Cushman M, de FS, Despres J, Fullerton HJ, Howard VJ, Huffman MD, Judd SE, Kissela BM, Lackland DT, Lichtman JH, Lisabeth LD, Liu S, Mackey RH, Matchar DB, McGuire DK, Mohler ER, III, Moy CS, Muntner P, Mussolino ME, Nasir K, Neumar RW, Nichol G, Palaniappan L, Pandey DK, Reeves MJ, Rodriguez CJ, Sorlie PD, Stein J, Towfighi A, Turan TN, Virani SS, Willey JZ, Woo D, Yeh RW, Turner MB. Heart Disease and Stroke Statistics-2015 Update: A Report From the American Heart Association. *Circulation* 2015;**131**:e29-e322.
32. Packer M, Narahara KA, Elkayam U, Sullivan JM, Pearle DL, Massie BM, Creager MA. Double-blind, placebo-controlled study of the efficacy of flosequinan in patients with chronic heart failure. Principal Investigators of the REFLECT Study. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1993;**22**:65-72.
33. Galie N, Hoeper MM, Humbert M, Torbicki A, Vachiery JL, Barbera JA, Beghetti M, Corris P, Gaine S, Gibbs JS, Gomez-Sanchez MA, Jondeau G, Klepetko W, Opitz C, Peacock A, Rubin L, Zellweger M, Simonneau G. Guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of pulmonary hypertension: the Task Force for the Diagnosis and Treatment of Pulmonary Hypertension of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC) and the European Respiratory Society (ERS), endorsed by the International Society of Heart and Lung Transplantation (ISHLT). *Eur Heart J* 2009;**30**:2493-2537.
34. Taichman DB, Ornelas J, Chung L, Klinger JR, Lewis S, Mandel J, Palevsky HI, Rich S, Sood N, Rosenzweig EB, Trow TK, Yung R, Elliott CG, Badesch DB. Pharmacologic therapy for pulmonary arterial hypertension in adults: CHEST guideline and expert panel report. *Chest* 2014;**146**:449-475.

35. Anker SD, Agewall S, Borggrefe M, Calvert M, Jaime CJ, Cowie MR, Ford I, Paty JA, Riley JP, Swedberg K, Tavazzi L, Wiklund I, Kirchhof P. The importance of patient-reported outcomes: a call for their comprehensive integration in cardiovascular clinical trials. *Eur Heart J* 2014;**35**:2001-2009.
36. Food and Drug Administration. Patient-Reported Outcome Measures: Use in Medical Product Development to Support Labeling Claims. *Guidance for Industry* 2009.
37. European Medicines Agency. Innovative drug development approaches: final report from the EMEA/CHMP think-tank group on innovative drug development.
http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/Other/2009/10/WC500004913.pdf Last updated: 2007; Accessed on: 4/30/15.
38. European Medicines Agency. Pilot project on adaptive licensing.
http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/Other/2014/03/WC500163409.pdf Last updated: 3-19-2014; Accessed on: 6/26/14.
39. Eichler HG, Oye K, Baird LG, Abadie E, Brown J, Drum CL, Ferguson J, Garner S, Honig P, Hukkelhoven M, Lim JC, Lim R, Lumpkin MM, Neil G, O'Rourke B, Pezalla E, Shoda D, Seyfert-Margolis V, Sigal EV, Sobotka J, Tan D, Unger TF, Hirsch G. Adaptive licensing: taking the next step in the evolution of drug approval. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* 2012;**91**:426-437.
40. European Medicines Agency. Guideline on good pharmacovigilance practices (GVP): Module VIII Post authorisation safety studies (Rev 1).
http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/Scientific_guideline/2012/06/WC500129137.pdf Last updated: 2013; Accessed on: 4/30/15.

41. Rosano GMC, Anker S, Marrocco W, Coats AJS. Adaptive licensing: A way forward in the approval process of new therapeutic agents in Europe. *Clinical Trials and Regulatory Science in Cardiology* 2015;**1**:1-2.
42. Anker SD, McMurray JJ. Time to move on from 'time-to-first': should all events be included in the analysis of clinical trials? *Eur Heart J* 2012;**33**:2764-2765.
43. Dunlay SM, Shah ND, Shi Q, Morlan B, VanHouten H, Long KH, Roger VL. Lifetime costs of medical care after heart failure diagnosis. *Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes* 2011;**4**:68-75.
44. Bradley EH, Curry LA, Krumholz HM. Strategies to reduce heart failure readmissions. *JAMA* 2014;**311**:1160.
45. Joynt KE, Jha AK. A path forward on Medicare readmissions. *N Engl J Med* 2013;**368**:1175-1177.
46. Rogers JK, McMurray JJ, Pocock SJ, Zannad F, Krum H, van Veldhuisen DJ, Swedberg K, Shi H, Vincent J, Pitt B. Eplerenone in patients with systolic heart failure and mild symptoms: analysis of repeat hospitalizations. *Circulation* 2012;**126**:2317-2323.
47. Borer JS, Bohm M, Ford I, Komajda M, Tavazzi L, Sendon JL, Alings M, Lopez-de-Sa E, Swedberg K. Effect of ivabradine on recurrent hospitalization for worsening heart failure in patients with chronic systolic heart failure: the SHIFT Study. *Eur Heart J* 2012;**33**:2813-2820.
48. Rogers JK, Pocock SJ, McMurray JJ, Granger CB, Michelson EL, Ostergren J, Pfeffer MA, Solomon SD, Swedberg K, Yusuf S. Analysing recurrent hospitalizations in heart failure: a review of statistical methodology, with application to CHARM-Preserved. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2014;**16**:33-40.

49. Rogers JK, Jhund PS, Perez AC, Bohm M, Cleland JG, Gullestad L, Kjekshus J, van Veldhuisen DJ, Wikstrand J, Wedel H, McMurray JJ, Pocock SJ. Effect of rosuvastatin on repeat heart failure hospitalizations: the CORONA Trial (Controlled Rosuvastatin Multinational Trial in Heart Failure). *JACC Heart Fail* 2014;**2**:289-297.
50. Amorim LD, Cai J. Modelling recurrent events: a tutorial for analysis in epidemiology. *Int J Epidemiol* 2015;**44**:324-333.
51. Abraham WT, Adamson PB, Bourge RC, Aaron MF, Costanzo MR, Stevenson LW, Strickland W, Neelagaru S, Raval N, Krueger S, Weiner S, Shavelle D, Jeffries B, Yadav JS. Wireless pulmonary artery haemodynamic monitoring in chronic heart failure: a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2011;**377**:658-666.
52. Rogers, J. Recurrent events analysis, not so straightforward!
<http://www.statisticsviews.com/details/feature/5786631/Recurrent-events-analysis-not-so-straightforward.html> Last updated: 1-28-0014; Accessed on: 1/28/14.
53. Novartis Pharmaceuticals. Efficacy and safety of LCZ696 compared to valsartan on morbidity and mortality in heart failure patients with preserved ejection fraction (PARAGON-HF). <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT01920711> Last updated: 2014; Accessed on: 5/30/15.
54. Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use (CHMP). Guideline on the choice of the non-inferiority margin. *EMA/CPMP/EWP/21 58/99* 2005.
55. European Medicines Agency Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use (CHMP). Guideline on missing data in confirmatory clinical trials (EMA/CPMP/EWP/1776/99). http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/Scientific_guideline/2010/09/WC500096793.pdf 2010.

56. Senn S. Disappointing dichotomies. *Pharmaceut Statist* 2003;**2**:239-240.
57. Lewis JA. In defence of the dichotomy. *Pharmaceut Statist* 2004;**3**:77-79.
58. Hawkins NM, Petrie MC, Burgess MI, McMurray JJ. Selecting patients for cardiac resynchronization therapy: the fallacy of echocardiographic dyssynchrony. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2009;**53**:1944-1959.
59. Snapinn SM, Jiang Q. Responder analyses and the assessment of a clinically relevant treatment effect. *Trials* 2007;**8**:31.
60. Vaduganathan M, Greene SJ, Ambrosy AP, Gheorghiade M, Butler J. The disconnect between phase II and phase III trials of drugs for heart failure. *Nat Rev Cardiol* 2013;**10**:85-97.
61. Hayward RA, Kent DM, Vijan S, Hofer TP. Multivariable risk prediction can greatly enhance the statistical power of clinical trial subgroup analysis. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2006;**6**:18.
62. Kent DM, Rothwell PM, Ioannidis JP, Altman DG, Hayward RA. Assessing and reporting heterogeneity in treatment effects in clinical trials: a proposal. *Trials* 2010;**11**:85.
63. The CONSENSUS Trial Study Group. Effects of enalapril on mortality in severe congestive heart failure. Results of the Cooperative North Scandinavian Enalapril Survival Study (CONSENSUS). *N Engl J Med* 1987;**316**:1429-1435.
64. The SOLVD Investigators. Effect of enalapril on mortality and the development of heart failure in asymptomatic patients with reduced left ventricular ejection fractions. *N Engl J Med* 1992;**327**:685-691.

65. The SOLVD Investigators. Effect of enalapril on survival in patients with reduced left ventricular ejection fractions and congestive heart failure. *N Engl J Med* 1991;**325**:293-302.
66. Cohn JN, Johnson G, Ziesche S, Cobb F, Francis G, Tristani F, Smith R, Dunkman WB, Loeb H, Wong M, . A comparison of enalapril with hydralazine-isosorbide dinitrate in the treatment of chronic congestive heart failure. *N Engl J Med* 1991;**325**:303-310.
67. Cohn JN, Tognoni G, Glazer RD, Spormann D, Hester A. Rationale and design of the Valsartan Heart Failure Trial: a large multinational trial to assess the effects of valsartan, an angiotensin-receptor blocker, on morbidity and mortality in chronic congestive heart failure. *J Card Fail* 1999;**5**:155-160.
68. Pitt B, Poole-Wilson PA, Segal R, Martinez FA, Dickstein K, Camm AJ, Konstam MA, Riegger G, Klinger GH, Neaton J, Sharma D, Thiagarajan B. Effect of losartan compared with captopril on mortality in patients with symptomatic heart failure: randomised trial--the Losartan Heart Failure Survival Study ELITE II. *Lancet* 2000;**355**:1582-1587.
69. MERIT-HF Investigators. Effect of metoprolol CR/XL in chronic heart failure: Metoprolol CR/XL Randomised Intervention Trial in Congestive Heart Failure (MERIT-HF). *Lancet* 1999;**353**:2001-2007.
70. Packer M, Coats AJ, Fowler MB, Katus HA, Krum H, Mohacsi P, Rouleau JL, Tendera M, Castaigne A, Roecker EB, Schultz MK, DeMets DL. Effect of carvedilol on survival in severe chronic heart failure. *N Engl J Med* 2001;**344**:1651-1658.
71. CIBIS II Investigators. The Cardiac Insufficiency Bisoprolol Study II (CIBIS-II): a randomised trial. *Lancet* 1999;**353**:9-13.

72. The Beta Blocker Evaluation of Survival Trial Investigators. A trial of the beta-blocker bucindolol in patients with advanced chronic heart failure. *N Engl J Med* 2001;**344**:1659-1667.
73. Taylor AL, Ziesche S, Yancy C, Carson P, D'Agostino R, Jr., Ferdinand K, Taylor M, Adams K, Sabolinski M, Worcel M, Cohn JN. Combination of isosorbide dinitrate and hydralazine in blacks with heart failure. *N Engl J Med* 2004;**351**:2049-2057.
74. Packer M, O'Connor CM, Ghali JK, Pressler ML, Carson PE, Belkin RN, Miller AB, Neuberg GW, Frid D, Wertheimer JH, Cropp AB, DeMets DL. Effect of amlodipine on morbidity and mortality in severe chronic heart failure. Prospective Randomized Amlodipine Survival Evaluation Study Group. *N Engl J Med* 1996;**335**:1107-1114.
75. Packer M, Carson P, Elkayam U, Konstam MA, Moe G, O'Connor C, Rouleau JL, Schocken D, Anderson SA, DeMets DL. Effect of amlodipine on the survival of patients with severe chronic heart failure due to a nonischemic cardiomyopathy: results of the PRAISE-2 study (prospective randomized amlodipine survival evaluation 2). *JACC Heart Fail* 2013;**1**:308-314.
76. Pitt B, Zannad F, Remme WJ, Cody R, Castaigne A, Perez A, Palensky J, Wittes J. The effect of spironolactone on morbidity and mortality in patients with severe heart failure. Randomized Aldactone Evaluation Study Investigators. *N Engl J Med* 1999;**341**:709-717.
77. Zannad F, McMurray JJ, Drexler H, Krum H, van Veldhuisen DJ, Swedberg K, Shi H, Vincent J, Pitt B. Rationale and design of the Eplerenone in Mild Patients Hospitalization And Survival Study in Heart Failure (EMPHASIS-HF). *Eur J Heart Fail* 2010;**12**:617-622.

78. Pitt B, Pfeffer MA, Assmann SF, Boineau R, Anand IS, Claggett B, Clausell N, Desai AS, Diaz R, Fleg JL, Gordeev I, Harty B, Heitner JF, Kenwood CT, Lewis EF, O'Meara E, Probstfield JL, Shaburishvili T, Shah SJ, Solomon SD, Sweitzer NK, Yang S, McKinlay SM. Spironolactone for heart failure with preserved ejection fraction. *N Engl J Med* 2014;**370**:1383-1392.
79. McMurray JJ, Packer M, Desai AS, Gong J, Lefkowitz MP, Rizkala AR, Rouleau JL, Shi VC, Solomon SD, Swedberg K, Zile MR. Angiotensin-neprilysin inhibition versus enalapril in heart failure. *N Engl J Med* 2014;**371**:993-1004.
80. Moss AJ, Hall WJ, Cannom DS, Klein H, Brown MW, Daubert JP, Estes NA, III, Foster E, Greenberg H, Higgins SL, Pfeffer MA, Solomon SD, Wilber D, Zareba W. Cardiac-resynchronization therapy for the prevention of heart-failure events. *N Engl J Med* 2009;**361**:1329-1338.
81. Tang AS, Wells GA, Talajic M, Arnold MO, Sheldon R, Connolly S, Hohnloser SH, Nichol G, Birnie DH, Sapp JL, Yee R, Healey JS, Rouleau JL. Cardiac-resynchronization therapy for mild-to-moderate heart failure. *N Engl J Med* 2010;**363**:2385-2395.
82. Bardy GH, Lee KL, Mark DB, Poole JE, Packer DL, Boineau R, Domanski M, Troutman C, Anderson J, Johnson G, McNulty SE, Clapp-Channing N, Davidson-Ray LD, Fraulo ES, Fishbein DP, Luceri RM, Ip JH. Amiodarone or an implantable cardioverter-defibrillator for congestive heart failure. *N Engl J Med* 2005;**352**:225-237.
83. Cuffe MS, Califf RM, Adams KF, Jr., Benza R, Bourge R, Colucci WS, Massie BM, O'Connor CM, Pina I, Quigg R, Silver MA, Gheorghiade M. Short-term intravenous milrinone for acute exacerbation of chronic heart failure: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* 2002;**287**:1541-1547.

84. Konstam MA, Gheorghiade M, Burnett JC, Jr., Grinfeld L, Maggioni AP, Swedberg K, Udelson JE, Zannad F, Cook T, Ouyang J, Zimmer C, Orlandi C. Effects of oral tolvaptan in patients hospitalized for worsening heart failure: the EVEREST Outcome Trial. *JAMA* 2007;**297**:1319-1331.
85. O'Connor CM, Starling RC, Hernandez AF, Armstrong PW, Dickstein K, Hasselblad V, Heizer GM, Komajda M, Massie BM, McMurray JJ, Nieminen MS, Reist CJ, Rouleau JL, Swedberg K, Adams KF, Jr., Anker SD, Atar D, Battler A, Botero R, Bohidar NR, Butler J, Clausell N, Corbalan R, Costanzo MR, Dahlstrom U, Deckelbaum LI, Diaz R, Dunlap ME, Ezekowitz JA, Feldman D, Felker GM, Fonarow GC, Gennevois D, Gottlieb SS, Hill JA, Hollander JE, Howlett JG, Hudson MP, Kociol RD, Krum H, Laucevicius A, Levy WC, Mendez GF, Metra M, Mittal S, Oh BH, Pereira NL, Ponikowski P, Tang WH, Tanomsup S, Teerlink JR, Triposkiadis F, Troughton RW, Voors AA, Whellan DJ, Zannad F, Califf RM. Effect of nesiritide in patients with acute decompensated heart failure. *N Engl J Med* 2011;**365**:32-43.
86. McMurray JJ, Teerlink JR, Cotter G, Bourge RC, Cleland JG, Jondeau G, Krum H, Metra M, O'Connor CM, Parker JD, Torre-Amione G, van Veldhuisen DJ, Lewsey J, Frey A, Rainisio M, Kobrin I. Effects of tezosentan on symptoms and clinical outcomes in patients with acute heart failure: the VERITAS randomized controlled trials. *JAMA* 2007;**298**:2009-2019.
87. Mebazaa A, Nieminen MS, Packer M, Cohen-Solal A, Kleber FX, Pocock SJ, Thakkar R, Padley RJ, Poder P, Kivikko M. Levosimendan vs dobutamine for patients with acute decompensated heart failure: the SURVIVE Randomized Trial. *JAMA* 2007;**297**:1883-1891.

88. Teerlink JR, Cotter G, Davison BA, Felker GM, Filippatos G, Greenberg BH, Ponikowski P, Unemori E, Voors AA, Adams KF, Jr., Dorobantu MI, Grinfeld LR, Jondeau G, Marmor A, Masip J, Pang PS, Werdan K, Teichman SL, Trapani A, Bush CA, Saini R, Schumacher C, Severin TM, Metra M. Serelaxin, recombinant human relaxin-2, for treatment of acute heart failure (RELAX-AHF): a randomised, placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet* 2013;**381**:29-39.
89. Efficacy, Safety, and Tolerability of Serelaxin When Added to Standard Therapy in AHF. <http://www.clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT01870778> Last updated: 11-13-2013; Accessed on: 1/17/14.
90. Efficacy and Safety of Ularitide for the Treatment of Acute Decompensated Heart Failure (TRUE-AHF). <http://www.clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT01661634> Last updated: 10-1-2014; Accessed on: 11/19/14.

Table 1. Advantages and Disadvantages of Composite Endpoints

Advantages	Disadvantages
<p>Reduces sample size and improves trial efficiency if each component is modifiable by treatment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power depends on number of events not number of patients 	<p>May reduce power if some components of the composite are unaffected by treatment</p>
<p>May allow adequate accrual of events over shorter follow-up</p>	<p>Length of follow-up may be inadequate to characterize safety profile of a therapy intended for chronic use</p>
<p>Captures multiple aspects of treatment effect (not limited to survival)</p>	<p>Overall treatment effect may be driven by components of lesser importance (i.e. the least serious events usually occur with the greatest frequency);</p> <p>Treatment effects on different components may be directionally different.</p>
<p>Avoids competing risk</p>	<p>In time-to-first event analyses, the first event may not be the most serious</p>
<p>Reduces need for multiple comparisons and allocation of type 1 error across different endpoint</p>	<p>Individual components still need to be reported separately (usually as secondary endpoints);</p> <p>Insufficient power to draw conclusions about treatment effects for all components of composite;</p> <p>Uncertainty regarding worrisome trends in components of the composite.</p>

HF = heart failure; MI = myocardial infarction

Table 2. Characteristics of Robust Composite Endpoints

A Composite Endpoint should:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide reliable and precise estimates of efficacy and safety 2. Be clinically meaningful or relevant to physicians, patients, and care providers in terms of characterising disease progression, stabilization, or reversal 3. Meaningfully characterise the burden of disease for patients 4. Yield information that could be used in conjunction with other data to determine societal valuation of new therapies or interventions 5. Improve the efficiency of clinical trials while maintaining high validity and quality

Table 3. Areas of Uncertainty, and Priorities for Future Research

Topic	Description
Component Selection	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Involve regulators early in discussion of which components will be included in a composite endpoint; may differ between acute and chronic heart failure trials 2. Explicitly state the rationale for using a composite in the study protocol
Clinical status composite endpoints	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Which variables accurately reflect an unbiased assessment of a patient's clinical status and burden of disease? 2. How can clinical composite endpoints be translated clinically (in terms of magnitude of effect and clinical relevance)? 3. How can quality of extended life be assessed? 4. Propose a quantitative assessment of the concordance of components of composite endpoints
Recurrent event analysis	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Methodology needs to be further studied and refined (e.g., how to deal with event clustering, ensure analysis is not driven by small proportion of patients). 2. How to confirm accuracy of assumptions and simulations used in modeling? 3. Involve regulators in planning modeling techniques for recurrent event analyses 4. Perform sensitivity analyses using standard time-to-event analysis 5. How to interpret results if recurrent event analysis results differ substantially in magnitude or direction from time-to-first event analysis.

Supplemental Appendix Table 1. Composite Endpoints in Heart Failure Clinical Trials

Trial	Primary Endpoint
CONSENSUS ⁶³	All-cause mortality
SOLVD-P ⁶⁴	All-cause mortality
SOLVD-T ⁶⁵	All-cause mortality
V-HeFT II ⁶⁶	All-cause mortality
Val-HeFT ^{16;67}	Co-primary endpoints All-cause mortality Mortality and morbidity (cardiac arrest with resuscitation, hospitalization for heart failure, administration of IV inotropic or vasodilator drugs for ≥ 4 hours without hospitalization)
CHARM ¹¹	Overall program: All-cause mortality Individual trials: Cardiovascular death or heart failure hospitalization
ELITE II ⁶⁸	All-cause mortality
MERIT-HF ⁶⁹	All-cause mortality
COPERNICUS ⁷⁰	All-cause mortality
CIBIS-II ⁷¹	All-cause mortality
BEST ⁷²	All-cause mortality
A-HeFT ⁷³	Composite score made up of weighted values for death from any cause, a first hospitalization for heart failure during the 18-month follow-up period, and change in the quality of life at 6 months.

Supplemental Appendix Table 1. Composite Endpoints in Heart Failure Clinical Trials

(continued)

Trial	Primary Endpoint
PRAISE ⁷⁴	All-cause mortality or cardiovascular morbidity (defined as hospitalization for at least 24 hours for acute pulmonary edema, severe hypoperfusion, acute myocardial infarction, or sustained or hemodynamically destabilizing ventricular tachycardia or fibrillation)
PRAISE II ⁷⁵	All-cause mortality
RALES ⁷⁶	All-cause mortality
SHIFT ¹⁴	Cardiovascular death or HF hospitalization
EMPHASIS-HF ⁷⁷	Cardiovascular death or HF hospitalization
TOPCAT ⁷⁸	Composite of death from CV causes, aborted cardiac arrest, or hospitalization for the management of heart failure
PARADIGM-HF ⁷⁹	Cardiovascular death or HF hospitalization
MADIT-CRT ⁸⁰	All-cause mortality or non-fatal HF events (signs/symptoms consistent with HF that was responsive to IV decongestive therapy on an outpatient basis or an augmented decongestive regimen with oral or parenteral medications during an in-hospital stay)
RAFT ⁸¹	All-cause mortality or HF leading to hospitalization
SCD-HeFT ⁸²	All-cause mortality
OPTIME ⁸³	Cumulative days of hospitalization for cardiovascular causes
EVEREST Outcome ⁸⁴	Dual primary endpoints of all-cause mortality and

Supplemental Appendix Table 1. Composite Endpoints in Heart Failure Clinical Trials

(continued)

Trial	Primary Endpoint
	cardiovascular death or hospitalization for heart failure
ASCEND ⁸⁵	Two co-primary endpoints: change in self-reported dyspnea at 6 and 24 hours after study-drug initiation and the composite endpoint of rehospitalization for HF and death from any cause
VERITAS ⁸⁶	Change from baseline in dyspnea over first 24 hours of treatment (individual studies) Incidence of death or worsening HF at 7 days (combined studies)
REVIVE ²⁹	Composite clinical score: Improved (patients considered themselves moderately or markedly improved at all pre-specified time points and showed no evidence of clinical deterioration); Unchanged (not improved or worse); Worse (died within 5 days, persistent or unresponsive HF symptoms after first 24 hrs of randomized therapy or worsening HF anytime within 5 days that required a rescue intervention specifically to relieve the symptoms, or patients considered themselves to have moderately or markedly worsened on global assessment at any of the follow-up time points).
SURVIVE ⁸⁷	All-cause mortality at 180 days
RELAX-AHF ⁸⁸	Two primary efficacy endpoints: change in patient-reported dyspnea by AUC of the VAS scores from baseline to day 5;

Supplemental Appendix Table 1. Composite Endpoints in Heart Failure Clinical Trials

(continued)

Trial	Primary Endpoint
	moderately or markedly improved patient reported dyspnea relative to the start of study drug assessed by 7-level Likert scale at 6, 12, and 24 hours
RELAX-AHF-2 ⁸⁹	Time to confirmed cardiovascular death through 180 days and time to worsening heart failure through 5 days (also considering death), with all-cause mortality through 180 days pre-specified as a safety endpoint.
TRUE-HF ⁹⁰	Two primary efficacy endpoints: 1) improvement in a hierarchical clinical composite endpoint (assessed at 6, 24, and 48 hours after start of study drug) including patient global assessment of symptomatic improvement, lack of improvement, or worsening; persistent or worsening heart failure requiring pre-specified mechanical or pharmacologic interventions, and all-cause death; 2) freedom from cardiovascular death throughout the duration of the trial.

AUC = area under the curve; CV = cardiovascular; HF = heart failure; VAS = visual analog scale